

The second of the 76 critical "material facts" proclaimed in the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions and which substantiate the allegations that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under 18 U.S.C., Section 242 has been continuously and/or deliberately breached by Judge Fletcher-

removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071, Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001."

1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001."

removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of nonfeasance under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1512, concealment, repetitiously and/or deliberately committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, my website), the first Judge that presided over my initial civil litigation, which include state crimes alleged in my 3-9-18 Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibit 37 on have committed other federal criminal activities. b.) committed the same other federal and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and being alleged in my 2-27-23 Motions and/or in my 2nd Addendum to 2-18-20 Official Complaint to positions by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being impartial and/or biased as presiding Judges as a result of being appointed to the elite 455(a) in refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, to set aside their judgments, and/or to deem each of their Orders as void due to the appearance of their Commerce due to their repetitious and intentional violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & crimes of "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and interference with interstate crimes of violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and the federal under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by repetitiously and/or intentionally: a.) committed the Federal y 14th Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 241, and/or my Civil Right the material facts that these Officers of the Court have repeatedly and/or deliberately violated initial civil litigation, which, also, include Judge Fletcher-Hill, because the evidence substantiate the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation and all of the other judges who presided over my Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges who initially presided over my appeal in Geller, the former presiding Judges over my appeal in the In Banc Review, namely, Judge John brought against the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II, the former presiding Judge, Judge J. will continue your investigation and disclose and resolve the allegations that indictments need to Moore issue the ORDERS and Judge Fletcher-Hill adheres to or reject the ORDERS, that both of you AND THE STATE ATTORNEY FOR BALTIMORE CITY, IVAN BATES, regardless of whether Gov. Wes criminal activities. 2.) 2nd REQUEST THAT THE U.S. ATTORNEY OF MARYLAND, EREK L. BARRON, Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal . Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to breach Federal U.S. Complaint because all of these government officials are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. officials that are cited in my 2-27-23 Motions and/or in my 2nd Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official former Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, or any of the government another former Governor of Maryland and former Mayor of Baltimore City, Martin O'Malley, the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore, another former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, Constitution for In Banc proceedings. b.) assign only judges who were not appointed by the

Hill asserts that: "2.) The material facts that the evidence of the first 5 Exhibits on the Petitioner's website, which accompany the her 12-17-18 Motions (Exhibit 60 on the Petitioner's website) and which are, also, material evidence in the Petitioner's Motions and in her 2017 Civil Complaint, prove, unequivocally, and in less than 5 minutes of reading, that, in 2015, Chief Judge Barbera intentionally committed the alleged prejudicial error of perjury in her 2015 Findings and Order, which, in turn, caused the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals (Exhibit 11 on the Petitioner's website) to have, yet, to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which include the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc judges from Circuit Court breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right by committing perjury and infringing upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right in breaching Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motions to dismiss the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that the owners of Baltimore City Public Schools from at least 1993 to the present, which include Kurt Schmoke and Martin O'Malley, every member of the City Council who was a member of the City Council between 1993 until the present, Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged to have repeatedly and deliberately violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts for decades. Further, the Petitioner asserts in her Motions that the prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera appears to constitute another example of "Fraud upon the Court, and in order to understand how the first 5 Exhibits substantiate that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury and/or Fraud upon the Court, one must know that Maryland Rule 7-104 allows a party 30 days to file an appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, with the first of the 30 days beginning on the day that the last judgment of the Circuit Court is "entered" into the record by the clerk. Exhibit 1 is copy of the document that gives the "entry" date of the 2015 In Banc judges' last judgment from the Circuit Court, namely, the denial of the Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration on July 6, 2015. Exhibit 2 is a copy of the docket receipt from the clerk of the Court of Appeals which gives the date that the Petitioner's 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals was filed in the record of this court, namely, on August 3, 2015. Exhibit 3 is a copy of the Court of Appeals' Order dated 9-21-15, which is signed by Chief Judge Barbera and declares that the Petitioner's Writ was denied because it was filed late. Exhibit 4 is a copy of the Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals which asserts, amongst other things, that the evidence in the record of this court, which include Exhibits 1 and 2 support the material fact that the Petitioner's 2015 Writ was filed in the Court of Appeals prior to the 30-day expiration date. Exhibit 5 is Chief Judge Barbera's Order dated 11-23-15, which, again, denies the Petitioner's 2015 Writ, but this time Chief Judge Barbera's denial is without any explanation".

Moreover, the evidence in the record of the Circuit Court in the Petitioner's present civil litigation, the evidence in the record in the Courts from other judicial proceedings, which should

include the Petitioner's Documentary, and/or the evidence on the Petitioner's website, substantiate the allegations in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23 and/or in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Honorable President, namely, that, in all of the Petitioner's other administrative and/or judicial proceedings that led up to my 2006, 2015, and 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court and/or in other administrative and/or judicial proceeding with whom the Petitioner did not file a Petition to the Supreme Court, the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were continuously and/or deliberately violated as a result of the presiding Judges' unlawful dismissals of the Petitioner's civil investigations before the Petitioner was afforded her right to a requested jury trial in order to continue to conceal the Findings and Recommendation of the Hearing Examiner, the original Finder of Fact, the OSHA Investigators, the OSHA Administrator, and the Findings in the dissenting Opinion of the Honorable Judge from the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals, which would substantiate the allegations that Martin O'Malley, Kurk Schmoke, Larry Hogan, former Chief Judge Barbera, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts.

The evidence in the record of the Circuit Court, in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23, in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Honorable President, on the Petitioner's website, and elsewhere in the Courts substantiate the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill, as an Officer of the Court and the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court knows and/or should have known that he was infringing upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section because: 1.) The written Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution require Judges to recuse themselves from cases in two situations, namely, where the judge has a financial interest in the case's outcome and where there is otherwise a strong possibility that the judge's decision will be biased and/or impartial. In the United States Constitutional Law, a Due Process Clause is found in both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The Constitution uses the phrase in the 5th and 14th Amendments, declaring that the government shall not deprive anyone of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. The 5th Amendment protects people from actions of the federal government, and the 14th protects them from actions by state and local government. 2.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), a federal law, orders the automatic disqualification of a Judge when there is an appearance of a bias and/or impartiality. 3.) As the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division, whose responsibilities include presiding over assigning Judges to preside over civil cases, as one of the presiding Judges over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, and even as one of the presiding Judges over her appeal in the In Banc Review in the Circuit Court, Judge Fletcher-Hill should have voluntarily disqualified and recused himself as mandated under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 due to there being an appearance that, as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint and over her appeal in the In Banc Review, he might be biased and/or impartial as a result of his privileged appointment in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who, along with former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and other former and/or present government officials, is being alleged in

the Petitioner's most recent Motions dated 11-1-23, in other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal acts. 4.) In 1994, the U.S. Supreme Court held that "Disqualification of a judge is required if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the judge's impartiality. Also, the Court cited that, if a judge's attitude or state of mind leads a detached observer to conclude that a fair and impartial hearing is unlikely, the judge must be disqualified." [Emphasis added]. *Liteky v. U.S., 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994)*. 5.) The Courts have repeatedly held that: a.) positive proof of the partiality of a judge is not a requirement, only the appearance of partiality. *Liljeborg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp., 486 U.S. 847, 108 S.Ct. 2194 (1988)* (what matters is not the reality of bias or prejudice but its appearance. b.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) "requires a judge to recuse himself in any proceeding in which her impartiality might reasonably be questioned. 6.) The Supreme Court has held that, if a judge wars against the Constitution in breaching the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution or if he/she acts without jurisdiction, then that judge has: a.) engaged in treason to the Constitution, which suggests that he/she is engaging in criminal acts of treason and may be engaging in extortion and/or in interference with interstate commerce, and since both treason and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no judge has immunity to engage in such acts. c.) given another example of his/her "appearance of partiality" which could potentially further disqualify the judge. 7.) The Courts have determined that, should another judge not accept the disqualification of the judge, then the second judge has evidenced an "appearance of partiality" and has possibly disqualified himself/herself. 8.) The Courts have affirmed that, if a judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that judge has acted in the judge's personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity and has, further, violated his/her oath of office. 9.) The Supreme Court has already established that "Fraud upon the Court" makes the Orders and Judgments of the Court void and that "a void Order is void at all times, does not have to be reversed or vacated by a judge, cannot be made valid by any judge, nor does it gain validity by the passage of time. The Order is void ab initio." 10.) The Supreme Court has decided that, should a judge issue any Order after he/she has been disqualified by Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S., and if the party has been denied of any of his/her property, then the judge could be engaging in the federal crime of "interference with interstate commerce" because the judge is, again, disqualified by law. 11.) Maryland Rule 18-102.11 asserts that a judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned. 12.) Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) Hearing--Other Motions states that "A party desiring a hearing on a motion, other than a motion filed pursuant to Rule 2-532, 2-533, or 2-534, shall request the hearing in the motion or response under the heading "Request for Hearing. The title of the motion or response shall state that a hearing is requested. Except when a rule expressly provides for a hearing, the court shall determine in each case whether a hearing will be held, but the court may not render a decision that is dispositive of a claim or defense without a

Moreover, the evidence in the record of the Circuit Court, in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23, in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Honorable President, on the Petitioner's website, and/or in other Courts substantiate the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill, as an Officer of the Court and as the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court, knows and/or should have known that he was infringing upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section because: 1.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, which have been upheld in cases brought before the Supreme Court of the U.S, require a Judge to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself/herself as the presiding Judge even if there is just an appearance that he/she would be biased and/or impartial. 2.) Each time he presided over assigning a Judge to preside over the Petitioner's approximate 24 Administrative position by Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, and/or Wes Moore, and that there is an appearance that each of these presiding Judges would be impartial and/biased due to his/her special appointment by Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, and/or Wes Moore, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions, other Motions, and/or in her Civil Complaint to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), in presiding over assigning himself as one of the presiding Judges over at least 4 of the Petitioner's Motions in her initial civil litigation and presiding over assigning himself as one of the a presiding Judges over at least 4 of the Banc Review, Judge Fletcher-Hill knew and/or should have known he was repeatedly and deliberately breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and/or Maryland Rule 18.102.11 because he should have voluntarily disqualified and recused himself due to there being an appearance that he would be biased and/or impartial due to his appointment in 2009 to the distinguished position as an Administrative Judge by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in my Motions and/or Civil Complaint to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. 4.) Each time Judge Fletcher-Hill assigned himself to preside over each one of my 4 Motions from my appeal in the Banc Review of my initial civil litigation, he knew and/or should have known that he was infringing upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) because Judge Fletcher-Hill was one of the Judges who presiding over at least 4 of my Motions from the initial civil litigation.

hearing if one was requested as provided in this section.” 13.) Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) asserts that, if a Judge has presided over an initial civil litigation, then the same Judge is prohibited from presiding over any appeal of the initial civil litigation.

Fletcher-Hill, as an Officer of the Court and the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court, and all of the 8 other Judges assigned by Judge Fletcher-Hill to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation know and/or should have known that they were infringing upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section because: 1.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 mandate that Judge Fletcher-Hill and each one of the Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges due to there being an appearance that Judge Fletcher-Hill and each of the other Judges whom Judge Fletcher-Hill assigned as presiding Judges would be biased and/or impartial because Judge Fletcher-Hill and each of the presiding Judges were appointed to their distinguished positions as Administrative Judges by Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, and/or Wes Moore, all of whom are being alleged in my present Motions dated 11-1-23, in other Motions, and/or in my 2017 Civil Complaint to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. Again, the evidence substantiate the material facts that, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning, thus far, 8 Judges to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation and who assigned himself as the presiding Judge over 8 of the Petitioner's Motions, was appointed to his cherished Administrative position by Martin O'Malley in 2009. The present presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II, was appointed to Maryland 8th Circuit for Baltimore City on April 2022 by Larry Hogan. Judge J. Geller was appointed to the 8th Judicial Circuit for Baltimore City in Maryland by Martin O'Malley and assumed office on May 18, 2012. Judge John Nugent was appointed Chair, Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee in 2019 by former Chief Judge Barbera and appointed chair of the Alternative Dispute Resolution for the Maryland Rules Subcommittee by the new Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Judge Joseph M. Getty. Judge Carrion's appointment by Chief Judge Barbera as an Administrative Judge for the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City became effective on January 12, 2020. Judge Mellissa Phinn was appointed as an Associate Judge on the 8th Judicial Court for Baltimore in Maryland by Martin O'Malley on December 28, 2012. Judge Julie Rubin was, also, appointed as an Associate Judge on the 8th Judicial Court for Baltimore in Maryland by Martin O'Malley on December 28, 2012. Judge Michel Pierson was appointed by former Chief Judge Barbera in 2013 as an Administrative Judge. Judge Karen Friedman was appointed by Martin O'Malley in 2014. 2.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other 7 Judges Judge Fletcher-Hill assigned to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation (excluding Judge Karen Friedman because the Petitioner did not know about Maryland Rule 2-311 at this time), from Judge Michel Pierson to the present presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber, knew and/or should have known that they were deliberately and/or continuously violating Maryland Rule 2-311 because each of these Officers of the Court failed to grant the Petitioner's repeated Motions for a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311. 3.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, namely, from the 3 panel of In Banc Judges to the presently presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber, knew and/or should have known that they were intentionally and/or repetitiously breaching Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner the right, as permitted under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, to an oral hearing before

deciding to deny or grant the Petition. 4.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's appeal in the Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, from Judge Fletcher-Hill to the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber, knew and/or should have known that they were intentionally and/or repetitiously infringing upon Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner the right to have 3 Judges presiding over her Banc Review as stipulated in Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 5.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or in her appeal in the Banc Review, which include the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber, knew and/or should have known that, in the Petitioner's present Motions dated 11-1-23, in other Motions, in her Memorandum for Judicial Review, and/or in her 2017 Civil Complaint, the Petitioner has alleged that, due to the 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera, the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which include the allegations that, in 2014, the Banc Judges from the Circuit Court intentionally committed perjury, violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material fact that, in 2014, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of assigning Judges to preside over the Petitioner's present civil litigation, who was the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 2014 civil litigation, deliberately violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motions to dismiss the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint. 6.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or in over her appeal in the Banc Review, which include the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber, knew and/or should have known that they should have set aside their judgment and deem their Findings and Order void as a law as mandated by Federal because there is an appearance that Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the presiding Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's civil case would be biased and/or impartial as a result of being appointed to their distinctive Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, and/or Wes Moore, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's present Motions dated 11-1-23, in other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. 7.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or in over her appeal in the Banc Review, which include the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber, knew and/or should have known that the Supreme Court has already ruled on disqualification of Judges under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and under certain circumstances, such as when there is even an appearance that the presiding Judge would be biased and/or impartial, the Judge is mandated to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself/herself as the presiding Judge. 8.) Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Rubin, and all of the Judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation in 2014 and/or 2012 and/or who presided over the appeals in the Banc Reviews of the 2014 and 2012 initial civil litigations, knew and/or should have known that they were violating the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242

The evidence in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23, in her Documentary, on her website, and/or in the Petitioner's 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Honorable President, substantiate the allegations that, in the Petitioner's present civil litigation and in all of the her other administrative and/or judicial proceedings, which did and/or did not led up to my 2006, 2015, and 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were deliberately and/or continuously breached due to the unlawful dismissals of the Petitioner's 2012 and 2014 Civil Complaints by the presiding Judges. Moreover, the Petitioner is alleging that the "UNDISPUTED FACTS", in her present civil litigations substantiate the assertion that deliberate and/or repeated efforts for dismissal of the Petitioner's civil litigation have, thus far, been made by all of the presiding Judges, which include Judge-Fletcher-Hill, as one of the presiding Judges in the initial civil litigation and in the appeals and as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to civil case who has presided over assigning Judges to at least 24 of the Petitioner's Motions, which would prevent the Petitioner moving forward in her civil case, thus, to Discovery and, ultimately, to having her requested jury trial, where the evidence gathered during Discovery would be exposed which would substantiate the material facts that Martin O'Malley, Kurk Schmoke, Larry Hogan, former Chief Judge Barbera, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts due to knowingly and willingly: a.) allowing our children to be exposed to lead-

As asserted in her 11-1-23 Motions and/or other documents, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in the Findings and Order docketed on 10-20-23 from Judge M. Schreiber, which responds to the Petitioners 9-8-23 Motions, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions substantiate that, in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, Judge M. Schreiber II fail to disclose, consider, and resolve the "UNDISPUTED FACTS" declared in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which are material in tracing the history of the alleged repetitious and/or intentional violations of the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by the Judge Fletcher-Hill by breaching numerous federal and state laws, which include violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11d as one of the presiding Judges and as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning all of the 8 Judges to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation.

ARGUMENT

by infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 in failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges because they knew and/or should have known that there was an appearance of their being impartial and/biased due to being appointed to the privileged positions of an Administrative Judge by Martin O'Malley, who was being alleged to have 2012 and/or 2014 Civil Complaints and/or in the Petitioner's appeals to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes.

contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades by the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City (the Mayor and Baltimore City Council) from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young and Brandon Schott, against all of the present members of the Council of Baltimore City (hereinafter "City Council") and against those who were members of the City Council since at least 1993. b.) having ignored for years the alleged heinous crimes against the Mayor of Baltimore City, owners of the public schools, namely, that of repetitiously and/or intentionally exposing our children to lead poisoning for decades and, thereby, breaching Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempting to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other possible criminal acts. c.) refusing to prosecute for over a quarter of a century the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have repeatedly and/or deliberately infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal acts and, in some instances, for over 25 years. d.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes.

CONCLUSION

Thus, in conclusion, the Petitioner pleads the Court grants her Motions.

Respectively Submitted



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

131 Calvin Hill Court

Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 15th day of October 2024, a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's 1st Motion For Immediate Disqualification Of Judge Fletcher-Hill As The Judge-In-Charge Of Presiding Over Assigning Judges To Preside Over The Petitioner's Civil Case, which include Disqualification From Presiding Over Assigning A Judge To Preside Over Her Motions Filed on 11-1-23, These Instant Motions, And The Petitioner's 2 Other Motions Filed On 10-14-24, These Instant Motions, And The Petitioner's 3 Other Motions Filed On 10-14-24 Because Judge Fletcher-Hill Has, Since 2018, Violated The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Repeatedly And Intentionally Breaching: a.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Has Committed "Fraud Upon The Court", Treason To The Constitution, And Interference With Interstate Commerce Because Judge Fletcher-Hill Failed To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Judge-In-Charge Of Presiding Over Assigning Presiding Judges Over The Petitioner's Civil Litigation As A Result Of There Being An Appearance That He Would Be Impartial And/OR Biased Due To His Elite Appointment In 2009 By Martin O'Malley, Who Is Being Alleged To Have Infringed Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - Genocide And/OR Has Conspired To Infringe Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091- Genocide. b.) Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) In Presiding Over 4 Motions In The Petitioner's Appeal In The In Banc Review Since Judge Fletcher-Hill Was One Of The Presiding Judges Over The Petitioner's Initial Civil Litigation. c.) Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution In Failing To Have A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motions From Her Appeal In The In Banc Review And To Grant The Petitioner An Oral Hearing Before The Panel Decided To Deny The Petitioner's Petition For An In Banc Review. d.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 In Failing To Assign A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To Preside Over The Petitioner's In Banc Review Who Were Not Appointed By Martin O'Malley, By Former Chief Judge Barbera, By Larry Hogan, And/OR By Wes Moore Because There Is An Appearance That Each Presiding Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges Would Be Impartial And/OR Biased Due To His/Her Unique Appointment By Martin O'Malley, By Former Chief Judge Barbera, By Larry Hogan, And/OR By Wes Moore, All Of Whom Are Being Alleged In The Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions And Other Motions To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - Genocide And/OR Have Attempted To And/OR Have Conspired To Infringe Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - Genocide. e.) Maryland Rule 2-311 In Failing To Grant The Petitioner Her Right To Have A Hearing As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) Motion To Have A Hearing On The Instant Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 was mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 1803 Research Blvd., Suite 125, Rockville, Maryland 20850.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

Petitioner is requesting a hearing on her Motions.

Cc: Hon. President, Hon. Military Tribunal, Public